REMARKS

By the present amendment, independent claim 1 has been amended to further

clarify the concepts of the present invention. Specifically, the coating solution for forming

the ink jet recording paper as claimed has been defined as consisting essentially of the

recited components. It is submitted that these amendments to claim 1 are helpful in

distinguishing the subject claims over the cited prior art and do not raise new issues which

would require further consideration and/or search. In addition, it is submitted that such

amendments place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or

simplifying the issues for appeal. Furthermore, no additional claims are presented without

cancelling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims. In view of the above, it is

submitted that entry of the above amendments is in order and such is respectfully

requested.

In the Office Action, claims 1, 2 and 4-6 were rejected under the first paragraph of

35 USC § 112 as not being enabled by the specification as filed. In particular, it now was

asserted that the composition "polyvinyl alcohol-cation monomer graft copolymer" was not

enabled, since one of ordinary skill in the art would not be able to ascertain what these

materials are as they are only identified by tradename.

This rejection under the first paragraph of 35 USC § 112 is under a different basis

that those stated in the prior Actions as it can be overcome by specific evidence.

Particularly, it was acknowledged that the rejection can be overcome by the submission

of evidence of the formulation of the tradenamed material at the time of the invention, such

as information set forth in sales brochures or product bulletins, which includes sufficient

detail about the materials involved. Reconsideration of this rejection in view of the

following comments and the previously submitted documents is respectfully requested.

As can be recalled, applicants have already submitted various materials showing

that suitable cationic fixing agents are available from Hymo Co., Ltd. of Japan. These

materials provide evidence of the formulation of the tradenamed material at the time of the

invention. It is therefore submitted that one of ordinary skill in the art in this country would

be able to obtain these agents without difficulty and practice the subject invention based

thereon. For the reasons set forth above, withdrawal of the rejection under the first

paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112 is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-6 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the

patent to Koide et al in view of the patent to Yasuda et al and the European patent

publication to Koji et al for the reasons of record. As before in making this rejection, it was

asserted that the patent to Koide et al teaches a recording paper with a coating

composition as set forth in the claim 1 and with the properties as recited in claim 1.

Without specifically so stating, it apparently was acknowledged that the disclosed recording

paper does not include a cationic fixing agent as defined in claim 1. Then, apparently

reliance was made upon the secondary patent to Yasuda et al for teaches the inclusion of

such an agent and also for teaching a cationic polyvinyl alcohol copolymer apparently in

reference to the specific subject matter of claim 3. The Koji et al patent publication

apparently was relied upon for teaching the additional subject matter of claims 2 and 5.

Reconsideration of this rejection in view of the following comments is respectfully

requested.

As mentioned above, independent claim 1 has been amended herein to recite that

the coating solution consists essentially of the recited components. As such, the claim now

recites that the coating solution consists essentially of a diaminostilbene-disulfonic acid

derivative (A) as a fluorescent brightening agent, a binder consisting essentially of a water-

soluble binder and a polyvinyl alcohol-cation monomer graft polymer (B) as a cationic

polymer fixing agent, the mixing ratio A:B in solid coating amount being within the range

of 1:6-2:3. It is submitted that the claimed inkjet recording paper as now recited in

amended claim 1 is not taught or suggested by the cited patents to Koide et al and Yasuda

et al or the European patent publication to Koji et al, whether taken singly on in

combination.

In previous responses, it was urged that was that one of ordinary skill in the art

would not be motivated to combine the patent teachings in the manner proposed by the

examiner. More particularly, it was urged that the portion of the Yasuda et al patent relied

upon (col. 9, lines 36-40) relates to a cationic polymeric substance which functions as a

water-proof agent. While it was acknowledged that such may be considered to be basically

the same as a cationic fixing agent of the subject invention which does provide water

resistance, however one of ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated to use such a

substance according to the patent with a water-soluble binder as in the presently claimed

ink jet recording sheet. In support thereof, it was stated that the Yasuda et al patent

teaches at col. 9, lines 36-39 that the water-proof agent must be water-soluble and further

that it is taught that this agent is to be used in conjunction with a water-insoluble binder.

This particular argument was responded to by asserting that the Yasuda et al patent

teaches at column 8, lines 38-39 that an water soluble or water insoluble additional binder

may be used. Thus, it was asserted that the binder according to the Yasuda et al patent

apparently can be a combination of an additional water soluble binder and the primary

water insoluble binder. It was submitted that the amendment to claim 1 that the binder

consists of a water-soluble binder distinguishes the subject claims over the teachings of

the cited patent.

Thus, a major argument made in the last response was that claim 1 defines the

binder of the ink jet recording material as only having a water-soluble binder by the use of

the phrase "consisting essentially of." It was urged that the cited patents do not teach such

a binder which is only of a water-soluble binder in order to help distinguish over the

teachings of this patent. However, the present Action alleged that the claims do not limit

the binder in this fashion and it was suggested that it may be of assistance to specifically

recite that the coating solution only includes one binder. As mentioned above, the

amendments to claim 1 herein now make it clear that coating solution consists essentially

of the components as recited and thus the binder contained in the coating solution is only

a water soluble binder.

As a consequence, it is submitted that one of ordinary skill in the art would not be

motivated to use such a substance according to the Yasuda et all patent with a water-

soluble binder as in the presently claimed ink jet recording sheet. In addition, applicants

previously submitted evidence in the form of a Declaration under 37 CFR § 1.132 which

presented experimental evidence regarding the products according to the Koide et al.

patent which demonstrated unexpected or surprising results for the claimed recording

paper relative to the recording paper of the cited Koide et al patent.

For the reasons stated above, withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

and allowance of claims 1-2 and 4-6 as amended over the cited patent publications are

respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that the subject application is now in

Serial Number: 09/673,567 OA dated April 23, 2003

Amdt. dated July 22, 2004

condition for allowance and early notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

In the event this paper is not timely filed, the undersigned hereby petitions for an appropriate extension of time. The fee for this extension may be charged to Deposit Account No. 01-2340, along with any other additional fees which may be required with respect to this paper.

Respectfully submitted,

ARMSTRONG, KRATZ, QUINTOS, HANSON & BROOKS, LLP

Donald W. Hanson/ Attorney for Applicants Reg. No. 27,133

Atty. Docket No. 001248 Suite 1000, 1725 K Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20006 (202) 659-2930 DWH/rab

23850

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE